IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| EDWARD POINDEXTER, |) CASE NO. 4:09CV3112 |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Petitioner, |) |
| v. DENNIS BAKEWELL, ESTHER CASMER, and ROBERT HOUSTON, |) MEMORANDUM) AND ORDER) |
| Respondents. | ,) |

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's Motions to Dismiss.¹ (Filing Nos. <u>7</u> and <u>8</u>.) Petitioner seeks dismissal of his Petition without prejudice "for <u>health</u> reasons." (Filing No. <u>7</u> at CM/ECF p. 1.)

Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss is granted in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil

Procedure 41(a)(1) and Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United

States District Courts. This matter is dismissed without prejudice.²

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

- 1. Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss (Filing No. 7) is granted and this matter is dismissed without prejudice;
- 2. Petitioner's second Motion to Dismiss (Filing No. 8) is denied as moot; and

¹Petitioner mailed identical Motions to Dismiss to the court and to the clerk's office. (Filing Nos. 7 and 8.) The clerk's office filed both motions in his case. (See Docket Sheet.)

²Although the court will dismiss the Petition "without prejudice," the court makes no determination of the truth or falsity of Petitioner's health claim; the court makes no determination whether a subsequent petition would constitute a second, successive, or abusive petition barred by the provisions of <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>2244(b)&(c)</u>, and <u>Rule 9 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts</u>; and, finally, the court makes no determination whether a subsequent petition would be barred by the one-year statute of limitations found in <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>2244(d)</u>. By moving to dismiss, Petitioner has assumed the risk that he may be precluded from filing another petition.

3. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 3rd day of August, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp United States District Judge

^{*}This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.